

REMARKS

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 15-20 and 30-33 under 35 U. S. C. § 102. The Examiner relied upon Hansinger et al. U. S. Patent 5,947,377 (hereinafter Hansinger) to support this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 19 and 20 under 35 U. S. C. § 102. The Examiner relied upon Austin et al. U. S. Patent 6,230,993 (hereinafter Austin) to support this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 19 under 35 U. S. C. § 102. The Examiner relied upon one Buschor U. S. Patent 4,788,933 (hereinafter Buschor) to support this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 19 and 20 under 35 U. S. C. § 102. The Examiner relied upon Chabert U. S. Patent 5,353,995 (hereinafter Chabert) to support this rejection.

Claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 1 now recites:

“[a] method of dispensing electrically charged particles of a coating material toward an object to be coated thereby, the method including providing a source of the coating material, providing a supply of electrical charge, providing a dispenser for dispensing the charged particles of coating material, providing on the dispenser a first electrode spaced a first distance from the object, coupling the source of coating material to the dispenser, providing multiple second electrodes and arraying the multiple second electrodes around the dispenser at a second distance from the object, the second distance being greater than the first distance, and coupling both the first electrode and the second electrodes to the supply of electrical charge.”

Claim 19 now recites:

“[a]pparatus for dispensing electrically charged particles of a coating material toward an object to be coated thereby, the apparatus including a port through which coating material is introduced, a terminal through which electrical charge is introduced, a dispenser for dispensing the charged particles of coating material, a first electrode provided on the dispenser and spaced a first distance from the object, the port being coupled to the dispenser, and multiple second electrodes arrayed around the dispenser at a second distance from the object, the second distance being greater than the first distance, both the first electrode and the multiple second electrodes being coupled to the terminal.”

None of Hansinger, Austin, Buschor, or Chabert discloses or suggests a method of dispensing electrically charged particles of a coating material toward an object to be coated thereby including providing, *inter alia*, multiple second electrodes and arraying the multiple second electrodes around the dispenser at a second distance from the object greater than a first distance between a first electrode and the object.

None of Hansinger, Austin, Buschor or Chabert discloses or suggests an apparatus for dispensing electrically charged particles of a coating material toward an object to be coated thereby including providing, *inter alia*, multiple second electrodes and arraying the multiple second electrodes around the dispenser at a second distance from the object greater than a first distance between a first electrode and the object.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 21 under 35 U. S. C. § 103. The Examiner relied upon the combination of Buschor and Applicant's description of prior art.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-4 and 21-23 under 35 U. S. C. § 103. The Examiner relied upon the combination of Chabert and Applicant's description of prior art.

The Examiner rejected claims 5-18 and 24-33 under 35 U. S. C. § 103. The Examiner relied upon the combination of Chabert, Schaupp et al. U. S. Patent 6,793,150 (hereinafter Schaupp) and Applicant's description of prior art.

Applicant submits that since independent claims 1 and 19 distinguish patentably from the prior art of record, dependent claims 2-11, 13-18 and 20-33, which depend directly or indirectly from one or the other of claims 1 and 19, patentably distinguish from the prior art of record as well. That which is neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the references cannot fairly be said to be disclosed by any combination of them. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the 35 U. S. C. § 103 rejection of claims 2-4, 21-33 is overcome. Further favorable consideration, culminating in allowance of claims 1-11 and 13-33 is respectfully requested.



The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, which may be due in order to constitute this a timely response to the July 26, 2005 official action, to Deposit Account 10-0435 with reference to Applicant's undersigned counsel's file 3030-72217. A duplicate copy of this authorization is enclosed for that purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard D. Conard".

Richard D. Conard
Registration No. 27,321
Attorney for Applicants

(317) 231-7285
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

INDS01 DSHI 799342v1